

**Sardinia** - Prov. Sassari, Lago del Coghinas 10 km NW Oschiri, ca. 200m, 2.V.1994, M. Sanetra leg.; Prov. Sassari, Monte Limbara, 700-1100m, 3.V.1994, M. Sanetra leg.; Prov. Nuoro, road N. 125 Dorgali-Baunei, ca. 13 km NW Punta Genna Coggina, 800-900m, 4.V.1994, M. Sanetra leg. [host of *S. testaceus*]; Prov. Nuoro, road N. 198 Seui-Ussássai, Cant. Arquerí, 980m, 6.V.1994, M. Sanetra leg.

**OTHER INVESTIGATED MATERIAL:** Lectotype ♀ of *T. caespitum brevicorne* Bondroit (hereby designated; Figs. 11, 16): labeled "Corse var. Revel[?]" [probably Emery's handwriting]"/"brevicorne teste Emery [handwritten]"/"LECTOTYPUS *Tetramorium caespitum brevicorne* Bondroit det. M. Sanetra, R. Güsten, A. Schulz 1996 [printed on red cardboard]"/"Museo Civico di Genova [printed]"/"Collezione Emery [printed]" (MCG); same labels (copied) as lectotype 8♀♀, 1♀, 1♂, part of 1♂ (MCG), paralectotypes of *T. caespitum brevicorne* Bondroit; Sardinia, Asuni, probably A. Krausse leg. 6♀♀ (MCG), paralectotypes of *T. caespitum brevicorne* Bondroit; Sardinia, Sorgono, A. Krausse leg. 3♀♀ (NMB); France, Corsica, Evisa, IX.1922, collector not given, ♀♀ (NMB).

Emery (1916) described this taxon from Sardinia and Corsica as part of a series he had formerly assigned to "*T. caespitum caespitum* var. *debilis* Emery, 1909" from Egypt. Later, Emery (1925) classified *brevicorne* as a variety of *T. biskrense* Forel, 1904 from North Africa and placed these taxa into a morphologically defined group in which the pronotum angles of the females are clearly visible from above. Though this character is found in several not necessarily related species, it allows one to distinguish unambiguously between *T. caespitum* and *T. brevicorne* in Sardinia and Corsica (compare Figs. 13, 16). In addition, the females of the latter are distinctly smaller (Tab. 3). Other distinguishing

Tab. 3: Differences between ♀♀ of *T. brevicorne* and *T. caespitum*

	HW (mm)	ML (mm)
<i>T. brevicorne</i>	1.06 ± 0.02	1.64 ± 0.05
<i>T. caespitum</i>	1.24 ± 0.02	2.18 ± 0.02

(based on Sardinian specimens, 10 for *T. brevicorne* and 4 for *T. caespitum*)

characters are conspicuous longitudinal rugae on the mesonotum (Fig. 16) and cross-meshed sculpturing on the occiput in *T. brevicorne* females.

Workers of *T. brevicorne* have repeatedly been stated to have shorter scapes than those of *T. caespitum* (Emery, 1916; Baroni Urbani, 1964; Casevitz-Weulersse, 1990). This difference, however, is slight at best and does not seem to be practical for species identification. In workers, separation can be better achieved by investigation of the sculpture of the petiolar nodes. A reticulate microsculpture is more or less evenly distributed on the postpetiolus in *T. brevicorne*, sometimes with a tendency to weaken towards the dome but never with a completely unsculptured and shining part of the surface (Fig. 2). In contrast, *T. caespitum* has this microsculpture restricted to the more basal part of the node becoming much weaker dorsally and usually leaving at least a small area completely without sculpture (Fig. 1). Similar but less obvious differences concern the petiolus. It seems worth noting that the main rugosity of the petiolar nodes is very variable in *T. brevicorne* and, though usually stronger than in *T. caespitum*, is not a useful character. In many but not all *T. brevicorne* workers the rugosity on the occiput is developed into a